



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/743,547

12/23/2003

Michal Louz-On

0026-0042

5793

44989 7590 10/28/2008

HARRITY & HARRITY, LLP
11350 Random Hills Road
SUITE 600
FAIRFAX, VA 22030

EXAMINER

TANG, KAREN C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2451

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/28/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/743,547	Applicant(s) LOUZ-ON, MICHAL	
	Examiner KAREN C. TANG	Art Unit 2451	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-5 and 7-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-5, 7-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2451

DETAILED ACTION

- A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/11/08 has been entered.
- Claims 1, 3-5, 7-29 are presented for further examination.
- Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9-13, 15-22, 25-29 are currently amended.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9-13, 15-22, 25-29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Specification

Claim 25-29 are objected to because according to MPEP 608.01, antecedent basis for the terms appearing in the claims, while an applicant is not limited to the nomenclature used in the application as filed, he or she should make appropriate amendment of the specification whenever this nomenclature is departed from by amendment of the claims so as to have clear support or antecedent basis in the specification for the new terms appearing in the claims. Applicant will be required to make appropriate amendment to the description to provide clear support or antecedent basis for the terms appearing in the claims provided no new matter is introduced.

Art Unit: 2451

“computer-readable memory” are lacking clear support or antecedent basis in the description of the specification. Please also see 37 CFR 1.75 (d)(1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because of: (1) According to page 8, par 0032, and page 9, par 0034 of the specification, a fetch bot, a content manager, and a URL manager are preferably configured as software framework. “A device” comprising a a fetch bot, a content manager, and a URL manager (i.e., software) does not include any functional hardware structure. "A device" comprising software is considered as program per se, which is not one of the categories of statutory subject matter. (2) A method claims 1 and 10 does not appear to tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus) or transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing, therefore, method claims 1 and 10 are not patent eligible process under 101 and is being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2451

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-9, 13-19, 23, 24, 28, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art hereinafter AAPA (Pages 13, Lines 11-19, Page 1, par 0002, 0003, 0004, Pages 2, 0005, 0006, and 0007) in view of Galai (US 2004/0177015) in further view of Moricz (US 2004/0117349).

1. Referring to Claims 1, AAPA discloses a method comprising: extracting a set of uniform resource locators (URLs) from one document or from multiple documents associated with a single web host (extracts URLS contains in web documents, refer to par 0004, page 2); identifying sub-strings occurring in multiple URLs in the set of URLs as session identifiers, (technique to locate the sub-strings in the URLS, refer to Lines 14-15, page 13) based on a particular rule (classification techniques which comprises rules, refer to Lines 14, page 13) and based on the sub-strings occurring in multiple URLs of the set of URLs (technique to identify sub-string as session identifier in the URL e.g., multiple occurrences of sub-strings, refer to Lines 14-19, page 13);

Although AAPA disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, AAPA did not explicitly disclosing "generating a clean set of URLs from the set of URLs by removing the session identifiers; and determining when at least one particular URL has already been crawled based, on a comparison of the particular URL to the clean set of URLs."

Galai, in analogous art, disclosing "generating a clean set of URLs from the set of URLs by removing the session identifiers (removing redundant parameters, thus generating a clean set of URLs, refer to 0028); determining when at least one second URL has already been crawled

Art Unit: 2451

based, at least in part, on a comparison of the second URL to the clean set of URLs (comparing URL, refer to 0069);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine AAPA and Galai because Galai's teaching of "generating a clean set of URLs from the set of URLs by removing the session identifiers; and determining when at least one particular URL has already been crawled based, on a comparison of the particular URL to the clean set of URLs." improves AAPA's system environment in order for system to provide more consistent search "hit" to the users (as supported by Moricz, refer to 0007) and also provides the users' of AAPA a better website search engine.

2. Referring to Claim 3, AAPA, Galai and Mooricz disclosed the method of claim 1, AAPA further disclosing where document or each of the multiple documents is a web document downloaded from a website (refer to par 0004, page 2).

3. Referring to Claim 5, AAPA, Galai, and Moricz disclosed the method of claim 1, AAPA further discloses where the particular rule comprises: determining that the sub-strings do not reference content (technique to identify sub-string as session identifier in the URL, refer to Lines 14-19, page 13);"

4. Referring to Claim 7, AAPA, Galai, and Moricz disclosed the method of claim 1, AAPA further discloses where the particular rule comprises: determining that the sub-strings contain

Art Unit: 2451

characters consistent with a session identifier (technique to identify sub-string as session identifier in the URL, refer to Lines 14-15, page 13);

5. Referring to Claim 8, AAPA, Galai, and Moricz disclosed the method of claim 1.

Although AAPA disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, AAPA did not explicitly disclosing “downloading content from the particular URL when the particular URL is determined to not already have been crawled”

Galai, in analogous art, disclosing “downloading content from the particular URL when the particular URL is determined to not already have been crawled (indexing the content only once, in order to ensure that the URL is not repeated, refer to 0019).”

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine AAPA and Galai because Galai’s teaching of “downloading content from the particular URL when the particular URL is determined to not already have been crawled” improves AAPA’s system environment in order for system to provide more consistent search “hit” to the users (as supported by Moricz, refer to 0007) and also provides the users’ of AAPA a better website search engine.

6. Referring to Claim 9, AAPA, Galai, and Moricz disclosed the method of claim 1, AAPA further discloses storing the set of URLs extracted from the at least one document, including embedded session identifiers, for use in later accessing the set of URLs extracted from the at least one document (refer to 0004, Page 1);

Art Unit: 2451

Although AAPA disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, AAPA did not explicitly disclosing "storing information based on the clean set of URLs for use in later determining whether additional URLs have already been extracted;"

Galai, in analogous art, disclosing "storing information based on the clean set of URLs for use in later determining whether additional URLs have already been extracted (after normalized, the normalized URL has to be stored in order to comparing for redundancy, refer to 0069)"

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine AAPA and Galai because Galai's teaching of "a URL manager configured to create clean versions of the URLs by removing the session identifiers from the URLs and to store the clean versions of the URLs." improves AAPA's system environment in order for system to provide more consistent search "hit" to the users (as supported by Moricz, refer to 0007) and also provides the users' of AAPA a better website search engine.

7. Referring to Claim 13, AAPA disclosed the method of claim 10.

Although AAPA disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, AAPA did not explicitly disclosing "removing identified session identifiers from the set of URLs; and storing the set of URLs with the removed session identifiers, as a clean set of URL."

Galai, in analogous art, disclosing "removing identified session identifiers from the set of URLs (removing redundant parameters, thus generating a clean set of URLs, refer to 0028); and storing the set of URLs with the removed session identifiers, as a clean set of URL (after normalized, the normalized URL has to be stored in order to comparing for redundancy, refer to 0069);"

Art Unit: 2451

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine AAPA and Galai because Galai's teaching of "a URL manager configured to create clean versions of the URLs by removing the session identifiers from the URLs and to store the clean versions of the URLs." improves AAPA's system environment in order for system to provide more consistent search "hit" to the users (as supported by Moricz, refer to 0007) and also provides the users' of AAPA a better website search engine.

8. Referring to Claim 14, AAPA, Galai, and Moricz disclosed the method of claim 13.

Although AAPA and Galai disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Galai and Bary are silent regarding "adding a generated session identifier to URLs in the clean set of URLs when the URL are to be used to access a web document."

Moricz in an analogous art disclosed, "adding a generated session identifier to URLs in the clean set of URLs when the URL are to be used to access a web document. (refer to 0035)'

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine AAPA, Galai and Moricz because Moricz's teaching of "adding a generated session identifier to URLs in the clean set of URLs when the URL are to be used to access a web document" improves AAPA's system environment in order for system to provide more consistent search "hit" to the users (as supported by Moricz, refer to 0007) and also provides the users' of AAPA a better website search engine.

9. Referring to Claim 15, AAPA discloses a device comprising: at least one fetch bot configured to download content on network from locations specified by uniform resource

Art Unit: 2451

locators/URLs (spider, refer to 0004, page 1 and page 2); a content manager configured to extract URLs from the content (spider extracts URLs, refer to 0004, pages 1-2), and identify sessions identifiers from URLs extracted from the content based (technique to identify sub-string as session identifier in the URL, refer to Lines 14-15, page 13), at least in part, on multiple occurrences of the session identifiers from a single web sites (classification technique e.g., multiple occurrences of sub-strings, refer to Lines 14-19, page 13); document or each of the multiple documents is a web document downloaded from a website (refer to par 0004, page 2); Although AAPA disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, AAPA did not explicitly disclosing "an URL manager configured to create clean versions of the URLs by removing the session identifiers from the URLs and to store the clean versions of the URLs."

Galai, in analogous art, disclosing "a URL manager configured to create clean versions of the URLs by removing the session identifiers from the URLs (removing redundant parameters, thus generating a clean set of URLs, refer to 0028) and to store the clean versions of the URLs (after normalized, the normalized URL has to be stored in order to comparing for redundancy, refer to 0069);"

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine AAPA and Galai because Galai's teaching of "a URL manager configured to create clean versions of the URLs by removing the session identifiers from the URLs and to store the clean versions of the URLs." improves AAPA's system environment in order for system to provide more consistent search "hit" to the users (as supported by Moricz, refer to 0007) and also provides the users' of AAPA a better website search engine.

Art Unit: 2451

10. Referring to Claim 16, AAPA, Galai, and Moricz disclosed the device of claim 15, AAPA further discloses where the content manager is further configured to identify the session identifiers based on locating sub-strings, within the URLs extract from the content, that contain characters consistent with session identifiers (technique to identify sub-string as session identifier in the URL, refer to Lines 14-15, page 13).

11. Referring to Claim 17, AAPA, Galai, and Moricz disclosed the device of claim 15, AAPA further discloses a database configured to store the downloaded content (refer to 0004, page 1).

12. Referring to Claim 18, AAPA, Galai, and Moricz disclosed the device of claim 15. Although AAPA disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, AAPA did not explicitly disclosing “discloses wherein the URL manager is further configured to determine when additional URL have previously been stored by comparing clean version of the additional URLs to the stored clean versions of the URLs extracted from the content.”

Galai, in analogous art, disclosing “discloses wherein the URL manager is further configured to determine when additional URL have previously been stored by comparing clean version of the additional URLs to the stored clean versions of the URLs extracted from the content (comparing URL, refer to 0069).”

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine AAPA and Galai because Galai’s teaching of “downloading content from the particular URL when the particular URL is determined to not already have been crawled”

Art Unit: 2451

improves AAPA's system environment in order for system to provide more consistent search "hit" to the users (as supported by Moricz, refer to 0007) and also provides the users' of AAPA a better website search engine.

13. Referring to Claim 19, AAPA, Galai, and Moricz disclosed the device of claim 15, AAPA further disclosing the session identifiers include characters from the URLs extracted from the downloaded content that do not reference content (refer to 0006).

14. Referring to Claim 23, AAPA disclosed the device of claim 20.

Although AAPA disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, AAPA did not explicitly disclosing "removing identified session identifiers from the set of URLs; and storing the set of URLs with the removed session identifiers, as a clean set of URL."

Galai, in analogous art, disclosing "removing identified session identifiers from the set of URLs (removing redundant parameters, thus generating a clean set of URLs, refer to 0028); and storing the set of URLs with the removed session identifiers, as a clean set of URL (after normalized, the normalized URL has to be stored in order to comparing for redundancy, refer to 0069);"

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine AAPA and Galai because Galai's teaching of "a URL manager configured to create clean versions of the URLs by removing the session identifiers from the URLs and to store the clean versions of the URLs." improves AAPA's system environment in order for system to provide more consistent search "hit" to the users (as supported by Moricz, refer to 0007) and also provides the users' of AAPA a better website search engine.

Art Unit: 2451

15. Referring to Claim 24, AAPA, Galai, and Moricz disclosed the device of claim 23.

Although AAPA and Galai disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Galai and Bary are silent regarding “adding a generated session identifier to URLs in the clean set of URLs when the URL are to be used to access a web document.”

Moricz in an analogous art disclosed, “adding a generated session identifier to URLs in the clean set of URLs when the URL are to be used to access a web document. (refer to 0035)’

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine AAPA, Galai and Moricz because Moricz’s teaching of “adding a generated session identifier to URLs in the clean set of URLs when the URL are to be used to access a web document” improves AAPA’s system environment in order for system to provide more consistent search "hit" to the users (as supported by Moricz, refer to 0007) and also provides the users’ of AAPA a better website search engine.

16. Referring to Claim 28, AAPA disclosed the computer-readable memory device of claim 25.

Although AAPA disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, AAPA did not explicitly disclosing "removing identified session identifiers from the set of URLs; and storing the set of URLs with the removed session identifiers, as a clean set of URL.”

Galai, in analogous art, disclosing “removing identified session identifiers from the set of URLs (removing redundant parameters, thus generating a clean set of URLs, refer to 0028); and storing the set of URLS with the removed session identifiers, as a clean set of URL (after normalized, the normalized URL has to be stored in order to comparing for redundancy, refer to 0069);”

Art Unit: 2451

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine AAPA and Galai because Galai's teaching of "a URL manager configured to create clean versions of the URLs by removing the session identifiers from the URLs and to store the clean versions of the URLs." improves AAPA's system environment in order for system to provide more consistent search "hit" to the users (as supported by Moricz, refer to 0007) and also provides the users' of AAPA a better website search engine.

17. Referring to Claim 29, AAPA, Galai, and Moricz disclosed the computer-readable memory device of claim 28.

Although AAPA and Galai disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Galai and Bary are silent regarding "adding a generated session identifier to URLs in the clean set of URLs when the URL are to be used to access a web document."

Moricz in an analogous art disclosed, "adding a generated session identifier to URLs in the clean set of URLs when the URL are to be used to access a web document. (refer to 0035)'

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine AAPA, Galai and Moricz because Moricz's teaching of "adding a generated session identifier to URLs in the clean set of URLs when the URL are to be used to access a web document" improves AAPA's system environment in order for system to provide more consistent search "hit" to the users (as supported by Moricz, refer to 0007) and also provides the users' of AAPA a better website search engine.

Claim 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant
Admitted Prior Art hereinafter AAPA (Pages 13, Lines 11-19, Page 1, par 0002, 0003, 0004,

Art Unit: 2451

Pages 2, 0005, 0006, and 0007) in view of Galai (US 2004/0177015) in further view of Moricz (US 2004/0117349) and Bary (US 20040158429) in further view of Najork (US 6,952,730).

18. Referring to Claim 4, AAPA, Galai, and Moricz disclosed the method of claim 1, although AAPA, Galai, and Moricz disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, AAPA, Galai, and Moricz are silent regarding “where the comparison of the particular URL and for each of the URLs in the clean set of URLs, and where the comparison is based on a comparison second URL to the clean set of URL is based on a comparison of a fingerprint value calculated for each of the URLs in the clean set of URLs.”

Najork, in an analogous art disclosed “where the comparison of the particular URL and for each of the URLs in the clean set of URLs, and where the comparison is based on a comparison second URL to the clean set of URL is based on a comparison of a fingerprint value calculated for each of the URLs in the clean set of URLs (refer to Col 9, Lines 4-17).”

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine AAPA, Galai, Moricz and Nojork because Nojork’s teaching of “where the comparison of the particular URL and for each of the URLs in the clean set of URLs, and where the comparison is based on a comparison second URL to the clean set of URL is based on a comparison of a fingerprint value calculated for each of the URLs in the clean set of URLs” improves AAPA, Galai, and Moricz’s system environment by provide an efficient data structures that keep in tracks of downloaded document due to crawling the web pages.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 10-12, 20-22, and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Applicant Admitted Prior Art hereinafter AAPA (Pages 13, Lines 11-19, Page 1, par 0002, 0003, 0004, Pages 2, 0005, 0006, and 0007).

19. Referring to Claim 10, AAPA discloses a method comprising: receiving a set of uniform resource locator (spider the URLs from the web, refer to 0004, Page 1 and Page 2); analyzing the set of URL for sub-strings that are structured in a manner consistent with session identifiers (classification techniques, refer to Lines 14, page 13); and further analyzing the set of URLs to identify of the sub-strings as corresponding to session identifier based on multiple occurrence of the sub-string in the set of URLs (technique to identify sub-string as session identifier in the URL e.g., multiple occurrences of sub-strings, refer to Lines 14-19, page 13).

20. Referring to Claim 11, AAPA, Galai, and Moricz disclosed the method of 10, AAPA further discloses where the set of URLs are extracted from a web document associated with a web host (refer to par 0004, page 2).

Art Unit: 2451

21. Referring to Claims 12, AAPA, Galai, and Moricz disclosed the method of claim 10, Galai discloses wherein the set of URLs are extracted from multiple documents associated with a single web host (refer to par 0004, page 2).

22. Referring to Claim 20, AAPA discloses a device comprising: receiving a set of uniform resource locator (spider the URLs from the web, refer to 0004, Page 1 and Page 2); analyzing the set of URL for sub-strings that are structured in a manner consistent with session identifiers (classification techniques to analyzing the URL to identify the sub-string as session identifier, refer to Lines 14, page 13); and further analyzing the set of URLs to identify of the sub-strings as corresponding to session identifier based on multiple occurrence of the sub-string in the set of URLs (technique to identify sub-string as session identifier in the URL e.g., multiple occurrences of sub-strings, refer to Lines 14-19, page 13).

23. Referring to Claim 21, AAPA, Galai, and Moricz disclosed the device of 20, AAPA further discloses where the set of URLs are extracted from a web document associated with a web host (refer to par 0004, page 2).

24. Referring to Claim 22, AAPA, Galai, and Moricz disclosed the device of claim 20, Galai discloses wherein the set of URLs are extracted from multiple documents associated with a single web host (refer to par 0004, page 2).

Art Unit: 2451

25. Referring to Claims 25, AAPA discloses a computer-readable memory device comprising: receiving a set of uniform resource locator (spider the URLs from the web, refer to 0004, Page 1 and Page 2); analyzing the set of URL for sub-strings that are structured in a manner consistent with session identifiers (classification techniques to analyzing the URL to identify the sub-string as session identifier, refer to Lines 14, page 13); and further analyzing the set of URLs to identify of the sub-strings as corresponding to session identifier based on multiple occurrence of the sub-string in the set of URLs (technique to identify sub-string as session identifier in the URL, e.g., multiple occurrences of sub-strings, refer to Lines 14-19, page 13).

26. Referring to Claim 26, AAPA, Galai, and Moricz disclosed the computer-readable memory device, AAPA further discloses where the set of URLs are extracted from a web document associated with a web host (refer to par 0004, page 2).

27. Referring to Claim 27, AAPA, Galai, and Moricz disclosed the computer-readable memory device of claim 25, Galai discloses wherein the set of URLs are extracted from multiple documents associated with a single web host (refer to par 0004, page 2).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is reminded that in amending in response to a rejection of claims, the patentable novelty must be clearly shown in view of the state of the art disclosed by the

Art Unit: 2451

references cited and the objection made. Applicant must show how the amendments avoid such references and objections. See 37 CFR 1.111(c).

- O'Shea et al "Method and apparatus for providing a coupon offer having a variable value" disclosing a method by which a coupon having a variable benefit is provided includes generating a coupon having a variable benefit, wherein a duplicate of the coupon is transmitted from one recipient to another recipient, receiving an indication that a first recipient has performed a qualifying action, such as receiving, registering for and/or redeeming the coupon offer from a second recipient of the coupon, and changing a benefit of the coupon retained by the second recipient after the indication is received.

- Shaked et al "Automatic network user identification" disclosing A system and a method for automatically acquiring the identity of a user requesting service from a service provider is provided.

Examiner's Notes: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner. In the case of amending the

Art Unit: 2451

claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karen C. Tang whose telephone number is (571)272-3116. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7 - 3.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571)272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Karen C Tang/

Examiner, Art Unit 2451

Application/Control Number: 10/743,547

Page 20

Art Unit: 2451